QF 3-93

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1898-99

191

(Medical)

Later references.

File No. 7-98

Serial Nos. 1-2

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-

Part B for July 98.

SUBJECT.

Complaint against Mr S.K. Hanumanna Rao assistant Surgeon at Davangere.

To The Dr Surgeon
The Comptroller
The P. Comm

888-98 & 15-7-99
This 3-93

degrading him to the lowest class of Sub-assistant Surgeons & placing him at the bottom of that class

D 1250—GPB—30,000-2-1-10

Inform
4

O.K.

Is this Council Decision

25/6/99

Noted

Under the Council Rules the appointment removal and promotion of Officers such as Asst Commr Asst Engineers are subjects for disposal by Council.

The present question is one of "degradation".

26/6/99

Two Town Officers namely Messrs Ramaswami Iyer & Sitaramaiyya were degraded a year or two ago. Now their cases placed before Council. Put up ref. 26/6/99

Subd to Secty

GOVERNMENT, MYSORE

52

In the cases of Mr. G. Subramanya & Mr. B. Rama Swami for Forest Officers, no reference was made to Council The orders degrading the first and suspending the second were passed by the 1st C.r & the Dewan.

The files which are bulky are placed on the Secty's table for inspection

There is no entry in the Council Journal on the subject.

26/6/99

In the present case too no reference to Council seems necessary

Subd to Dewan

26/6/99

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
387
Jun: 85
1899
From
OFFICE OF THE PLAGUE COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE
2700
JUN 1899
PLAGUE BRANCH.

THE PLAGUE COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE.

To

THE SECY. TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GEN. & REV. DEPTS.

Dated 23rd June 99

Despatched

Received

General No. 11103
No.

Enclosure No. 2, (1 memo & 1 file of corresp.)

Forwarding for orders of Govt the file of papers regarding the Complaint of one Ranga-swamie Naidu of Madras against the Conduct of Mr S.K. Hanumantha Rau, Assistant Surgeon at Davengere in not allowing his mother to see her dying son, with a memo containing Plague Comr's opinion

References to be marked.

Submitted to Secy for orders.

JB
24/6/99

Put up to Secy for orders.

24/6/99

This is a lamentable case in

1458

which the misconduct or action of the Med Off has caused a scandal — The summary of the facts clearly set forth in the Plague Comrs letters and the Med Offrs own admissions show that Hanumanth Rao was guilty of gross dereliction of duty that he betrayed great indecision and was wanting in ordinary feelings of humanity. In short, he has proved himself quite unworthy of the confidence reposed in him by Govt — On a careful consideration of the whole case it must appear true that he well deserves dismissal as urgently recommended by the Senior Surgeon. The reduction to a lower grade will be a very lenient & inadequate punishment. However as the Plague Com proposes it, I write upon but provided Hanumanth Rao is placed at the bottom of the list of Asst Surgeons so as to debar him from promotion to a higher grade for sometime to come — Referred

BH Thumbay
24. 6. 99

Very urgent —
Put up to Secy —
25/6/99

I agree to the man
being degraded as a
punishment to a
Sub-asst Surgeon
and placed at
the bottom of
Class 3 of Sub Asst
Surgeons - The Senior
Surgeon, ~~to be reported~~
~~to Cause him to be~~
~~placed under a~~
~~rule to place him~~
may be informed that
it seems inexpedient again to entrust him
~~to place a man~~ him
as an independent medical Charge until he gives proof of improved Conduct
and that it is desirable
to place him under
a higher Medl. Off.
and to require a report on his Conduct
at ~~the~~ 3 months the Senior

12-7-99

Draft accepted & submitted to
Ld Lt before open - I
think this is not a Com.
matter - Regard
respect to proceedings

~~re~~ to the cases of Forest-
Officers Rheeper Rama-
-swami Iyer & Sitaramayya
& also to the Rules & O
Verify before you d

Precedents
seen d 13-7-99
13-7-99

OFFICE OF THE
PLAGUE COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE.

No. 11103
Enc: 2 (1 file of Correspondence + 1 memo)

DATED BANGALORE, 23rd June 1899

From

THE PLAGUE COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE.

med f-98-1

To

The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
Gen. and Departments

SIR,

I have the honor to forward herewith the file of papers relating to the complaint of one Rangasawmi Naidu of Madras against the conduct of Mr. S.K. Hanumantha Rau Assistant Surgeon at Davangere in not allowing Rangasawmi Naidu's mother to see her dying son, knowing that she had gone from Madras, an uninfected area and a memo containing my opinion, for the orders of Government.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant

For Plague Commissioner
in Mysore.

Memo

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Petition dated 23d February 1899 from
T. N. Rangaswami Naidu of Madras

This is a petition & complaint from
one Rangaswami Naidu of Madras
against the Inspecting Medical Officer
at Yeswantpur and against Mr. S. K.
HanumanthaRao, Assistant Surgeon
doing duty as Inspecting Medical
Officer at Davengere, to the effect
(1) that his mother who was a passenger
from Madras to Davengere and was
going to Davengere to see her dying
Son, was wrongly entered in the list of
passengers coming from an infec-
ted area by the Inspecting Medical
Officer, Yeswantpur, although Madras
was not an infected place and as
a consequence was on arrival at
Davengere, placed in the detention
shed and kept there till next
morning

morning

(2) That Mr Hanumanthdas, Assistant Surgeon at Davengere in charge of the Inspection of arrivals did not examine the mother and allow her to go home to see her dying son although he was twice requested to do so by petitioner during the night and Mr Hanumanthdas himself knew the urgency of the case being the medical man treating the dying son. The result was the son to see whom Petitioner's mother had come all the way from Madras died during the night without the mother seeing him. The first item does not call for much consideration The Inspecting Medical Officer at Yeswantpur appears to have entered

entered the name of the mother in the list of passengers coming from Bangalore which was an infected place by mistake. His explanation is accepted.

We have next to consider the other and far more serious portion of the complaint that referring to the inhuman conduct of the Assistant Surgeon at Davengere Mr HanumanthaRao.

The Assistant-Surgeon admits in his explanations that the woman was put in the Detention Camp on arrival at Davengere. He admits that he was attending her son and that he knew he was dying and that she had come all the way from Madras to see her son before he died. He admits also that he refused either to go to the Camp and examine the mother as requested by

by Petitioner or to allow Petitioner to bring his mother to the Assistant Surgeons house for Examination so that she might be released from detention, and enabled to go and see her son; and he further admits that the Petitioner came twice to him, once shortly after the arrival of the train at about midnight, and again at about 3. A.M in the morning showing clearly how urgent his need was.

It only remains therefore to consider how far his explanation of his conduct was or was not satisfactory

His explanation was to the effect that the Petitioner's mother's name had been entered in the list of passengers from an infected area and that the woman was accordingly taken

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

taken to the Detention Camp by the Plague Police on duty, that the Procedure was for passengers from infected area arriving by the night train to be kept in the Detention Camp till next morning, when the Assistant Surgeon usually went & examined them that such being the procedure he could not interfere in the matter, and that he explained the situation to the petitioner and promised to have the woman examined early next morning, which he did. Now, as Inspecting Officer, the question whether or not a person need be detained in Camp rested solely with him. If it was in his power to have the woman released in the morning, he must have known

from the Petitioner that the
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE
woman was from an uninfected
area, Madras it must have
been plain to him that either the
Davengere Plague Police were making
a mistake or the woman had been
entered wrongly in the list and it
was his duty to have had the
mistake immediately rectified.

Again as pointed out above,
if he had power to release from
detention at one time he had
power to do so at any other time
and if he had power to release
a person as unsuspicious and
healthy though from an infected
area, much more must he
have had the power of doing
so if the person was from an
uninfected area and only de-
tained under a mistake.

Again apart from the
question

question of power or duty there
is the question of humanity. Knowing
the circumstances, it was surely
his duty, a duty which any man
with any feeling of humanity in
him could not but feel to be
an urgent and pressing one to
at once go and do his utmost
to get the woman released.
Even supposing he had no power
over the Police at the Camp, even
admitting his plea that he could
not legally interfere with the
Police it was still his duty
to him as a medical man in the
interests of the dying man, his
patient and from the stand-
point of ordinary humanity,
to go to the camp and assure
the Police that there had been
a mistake that the woman
was not from an infected
area,

area, that she must be released, that he would as Inspecting Medical Officer be responsible for her, but that in any case she must be allowed to see her dying son but no, that would have involved the inconvenience of turning out at midnight and going to the camp, therefore the procedure must be followed, a mother must be detained & kept apart from her dying son, the son must die without seeing his mother for the last time all because an Assistant Surgeon is too lazy and too wanting in all feelings of ordinary humanity to take the little trouble necessary to procure the woman's release

It is clear from his further Explanation that Assistant Surgeon HanumanthaRao does not realise the

the responsibility of his position as medical Officer and has allowed departmental differences and disputes to influence his action as medical Officer in charge of inspection

I consider and the Senior Surgeon concurs in my opinion that the Assistant Surgeon Mr Hanumantha Rao has been guilty of negligence of duty coupled with a lack of all sympathy and consideration both with the public under his charge as Inspection Officer and with a patient in his charge medically which marks him as unfit for any respon-sible post. Considering also the fact mentioned in the Senior Surgeon's report that

the

he has already been punished by stoppage of promotion for one year for failing to go and see a Planter who was sick, I strongly recommend his reduction to the rank of Sub Assistant Surgeon, with a direction that he should never be placed in independent charge. The Senior Surgeon had expressed an opinion that the man should be dismissed and has since agreed to the alternative proposed in the last sentence.

J. Macnamara

Plague Commissioner
in Mysore

I wish the pictures could be made more definite & clear.

for G.I.
1899 ... 1.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

63

Read

Med 7-28-2

Letter No. 11103 dated the 23rd June 1899, from the Plague Commissioner in Mysore reporting on the Complaint of one Rangasamu Naidu of Madras against the Conduct of Mr. S.K. Hanumantha Row Assistant Surgeon at Davangere in not allowing the said Rangasamu Naidu's mother to see her dying son (Petu's brother) at Davangere knowing that she had gone for that purpose, from Madras an un-infected area.

Print the letter & the Memo

Sealed & sent Ex

11720 15-7-99.

7-2

The Ist has two Heads
Seems in Manuscript the
Mem print H/E
15/7/99

Order thereon No 888-90
5-93

This is a lamentable

Case in which the misconduct
or action of the Medical officer
has caused a serious scandal
the summary of the facts clearly of the case
as set forth in the Plague Com^rs
Mem^o received with the letter
read above and the Asst Surgns
own admissions show that he
Ramumentta Row was guilty of
gross dereliction of duty, & that
he betrayed great indiscretion
and was wanting in the ordinary
feelings of humanity he has
proved himself quite unworthy
of the Confidence reposed in
him by Govt On a careful
Consideration of the whole case,
Govt are inclined to think
that the Asst Surgn deserves

end of the recommendation
made but as proposed
by the Resident Cour. & the Senior
Surgeon, Govt take a lenient
view of the case and appoint
Govt
direct that the Asst Surgn
M. J. K. Hanumantha Rau
be degraded as a punishment
to the lowest class of
the grade & to a sub-Asst Surgn and be
Sub Asst Surgeons and be
placed at the bottom of that class
3 of Sub-Asst Surgeons

The Senior Surgeon will be
informed that it is
expedient again to entrust
Mr Hanumantha Rau with
any independent medical
charge until he gives proof
of improved conduct

To. The Resident Cour. in Mysore
Senior Surgn
Comptroller to Govt

4.
15-7-99

Secretary

4/11
15-7-99

READ—

Letter No. 11103, dated the 23rd June 1899, from the Plague Commissioner in Mysore.

I have the honor to forward herewith the file of papers relating to the complaint of one Rangaswami Naidu of Madras against the conduct of Mr. S. K. Hanumantha Rau, Assistant Surgeon at Davangere in not allowing Rangaswami Naidu's mother to see her dying son, knowing that she had gone from Madras, an uninfected area; and a Memo containing my opinion, for the orders of Government.

MEMO

Petition, dated 23rd February 1899, from R. N. Rangasawmi Naidu of Madras.

This is a petition of complaint from one Rangaswami Naidu of Madras against the Inspecting Medical Officer at Yesvantpur and against Mr. S. K. Hanumantha Rao, Assistant Surgeon, doing duty as Inspecting Medical Officer at Davangere, to the effect—

(1) that his mother, who was a passenger from Madras to Davangere and was going to Davangere to see her dying son, was wrongly entered in the list of passengers coming from an infected area by the Inspecting Medical Officer, Yesvantpur, although Madras was not an infected place, and as a consequence, was, on arrival at Davangere, placed in the Detention Shed, and kept there till next morning

(2) that Mr. Hanumantha Rao, Assistant Surgeon at Davangere in charge of the inspection of arrivals, did not examine the mother and allow her to go home to see her dying son, although he was twice requested to do so by petitioner during the night, and Mr. Hanumantha Rao himself knew the urgency of the case, being the medical man treating the dying son. The result was the son, to see whom petitioner's mother had come all the way from Madras, died during the night without the mother seeing him.

The first item does not call for much consideration. The Inspecting Medical Officer at Yesvantpur appears to have entered the name of the mother in the list of passengers coming from Bangalore, which was an infected place, by mistake. His explanation is accepted.

We have next to consider the other and far more serious portion of the complaint: that referring to the inhuman conduct of the Assistant Surgeon at Davangere, Mr. Hanumantha Rao.

The Assistant Surgeon admits in his explanations that the woman was put in the Detention Camp on arrival at Davangere. He admits that he was attending her son, and that he knew he was dying, and that she had come all the way from Madras to see her son, before he died. He admits also that he refused either to go to the camp and examine the mother as requested by petitioner or to allow petitioner to bring his mother to the Assistant Surgeon's house for examination, so that she might be released from detention, and enabled to go and see her son; and he further admits that the petitioner came twice to him, once shortly after the arrival of the train at about midnight, and again at about 3 A. M. in the morning, showing clearly how urgent his need was.

It only remains therefore to consider how far his explanation of his conduct was or was not satisfactory.

His explanation was to the effect that the petitioner's mother's name had been entered in the list of passengers from an infected area, and that the woman was accordingly taken to the Detention Camp by the Plague Police on duty, that the procedure was for passengers from infected area arriving by the night train to be kept in the Detention Camp till next morning, when the Assistant Surgeon *usually* went and examined them; that such being the procedure, he could not interfere in the matter, and that he explained the situation to the petitioner and promised to have the woman examined early next morning, which he did. Now, as Inspecting Officer, the question whether or not a person need be detained in camp rested solely with him. If it was in his power to have the woman released in the morning, he must have known it was equally in his power to have her released at any other time he chose to give the order. Again, he must have known that it was solely for his convenience, because he has his ordinary medical duties to perform by day, and could not be expected to meet the midnight train each night, that the procedure of placing passengers from an infected area in the Detention Camp for the night so that they could be examined next morning, was adopted. And he must therefore have known that he could, if he chose, and on any night he chose, examine arrivals on the night of arrival instead of next morning. Again, on learning, as he must have learnt from the petitioner that the woman was from an uninfected area, Madras, it must have been plain to him, that either the Davangere Plague Police were making a mistake or the woman had been entered wrongly in the list, and it was his duty to have had the mistake immediately rectified.

General, dated 15th July 1899.

Again, as pointed out above, if he had power to release from detention at one time, he had power to do so at any other time, and if he had power to release a person as unsuspicious and healthy, though from an infected area, much more must he have had the power of doing so if the person was from an uninfected area, and only detained under a mistake.

Again, apart from the question of power or duty, there is the question of humanity. Knowing the circumstances, it was surely his duty, a duty which any man with any feeling of humanity in him could not but feel to be an urgent and pressing one, to at once go and do his utmost to get the woman released. Even supposing he had no power over the Police at the camp, even admitting his plea that he could not legally interfere with the Police, it was still his duty, both as a medical man, in the interests of the dying man, his patient, and from the stand-point of ordinary humanity, to go to the camp and assure the Police that there had been a mistake, that the woman was not from an infected area, that she must be released, that he would as Inspecting Medical Officer be responsible for her, but that in any case she must be allowed to see her dying son; but no, that would have involved the inconvenience of turning out at midnight and going to the camp; therefore the "procedure" must be followed, a mother must be detained and kept apart from her dying son, the son must die without seeing his mother for the last time all because an Assistant Surgeon is too lazy and too ...ting in all feelings of ordinary humanity to take the little trouble necessary to procure the woman's release.

It is clear from his further explanation that Assistant Surgeon Hanumantha Rao does not realise the responsibility of his position as Medical Officer, and has allowed departmental differences and disputes to influence his action as Medical Officer in charge of inspection.

I consider, and the Senior Surgeon concurs in my opinion, that the Assistant Surgeon Mr. Hanumantha Rao has been guilty of negligence of duty coupled with a lack of all sympathy and consideration, both with the public under his charge as Inspecting Officer and with a patient in his charge medically which marks him as unfit for any responsible post. Considering also the fact mentioned in the Senior Surgeon's report that he has already been punished by stoppage of promotion for one year for failing to go and see a planter who was sick, I strongly recommend his reduction to the rank of Sub-Assistant Surgeon, with a direction that he should never be placed in independent charge. The Senior Surgeon had expressed an opinion that the man should be dismissed, and has since agreed to the alternative proposed in the last sentence

---

No. 888-90—Mis. 3-93, dated Bangalore, 15th July 1899.

Order thereon.—The summary of the facts of the case as set forth in the Plague Commissioner's Memo received with the letter read above and the Assistant Surgeon's own admissions, show that Mr. Hanumantha Rao was guilty of gross dereliction of duty, and that he betrayed great indiscretion and was wanting in the ordinary feelings of humanity. He has proved himself quite unworthy of the confidence reposed in him by Government. On a careful consideration of the whole case and of the recommendation made by the Plague Commissioner and the Senior Surgeon, Government direct that Assistant Surgeon Mr. S. K. Hanumantha Rao be degraded, as a punishment, to the lowest class of Sub-Assistant Surgeons and placed at the bottom of that class.

2. The Senior Surgeon will be informed that it is inexpedient again to entrust Mr. Hanumantha Rao with any independent medical charge until he gives proof of improved conduct.

C. SREENIVASIENGAR,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Plague Commissioner in Mysore.
The Senior Surgeon and Sanitary Commissioner with the Government of Mysore.
The Comptroller to the Government of Mysore.

Exd.—H.A.B.

READ—

Letter No. 11103, dated the 23rd June 1899, from the Plague Commissioner in Mysore.

I have the honor to forward herewith the file of papers relating to the complaint of one Rangaswami Naidu of Madras against the conduct of Mr. S. K. Hanumantha Rau, Assistant Surgeon at Davangere, in not allowing Rangaswami Naidu's mother to see her dying son, knowing that she had gone from Madras, an uninfected area; and a Memo containing my opinion, for the orders of Government.

MEMO

Petition, dated 23rd February 1899, from K. N. Rangasawmi Naidu of Madras.

This is a petition of complaint from one Rangaswami Naidu of Madras against the Inspecting Medical Officer at Yesvantpur and against Mr. S. K. Hanūmanthā Rao, Assistant Surgeon, doing duty as Inspecting Medical Officer at Davangere, to the effect-

(1) that his mother, who was a passenger from Madras to Davangere and was going to Davangere to see her dying son, was wrongly entered in the list of passengers coming from an infected area by the Inspecting Medical Officer, Yesvantpur, although Madras was not an infected place, and as a consequence, was, on arrival at Davangere, placed in the Detention Shed, and kept there till next morning;

(2) that Mr Hanumantha Rao, Assistant Surgeon at Davangere in charge of the inspection of arrivals, did not examine the mother and allow her to go home to see her dying son, although he was twice requested to do so by petitioner during the night, and Mr. Hanumantha Rao himself knew the urgency of the case being the medical man treating the dying son. The result was the son, to see whom petitioner's mother had come all the way from Madras, died during the night without the mother seeing him.

The first item does not call for much consideration. The Inspecting Medical Officer at Yesvantpur appears to have entered the name of the mother in the list of passengers coming from Bangalore, which was an infected place, by mistake. His explanation is accepted.

We have next to consider the other and far more serious portion of the complaint: that referring to the inhuman conduct of the Assistant Surgeon at Davangere, Mr. Hanumantha Rao.

The Assistant Surgeon admits in his explanations that the woman was put in the Detention Camp on arrival at Davangere. He admits that he was attending her son, and that he knew he was dying, and that she had come all the way from Madras to see her son, before he died. He admits also that he refused either to go to the camp and examine the mother as requested by petitioner or to allow petitioner to bring his mother to the Assistant Surgeon's house for examination, so that she might be released from detention, and enabled to go and see her son; and he further admits that the petitioner came twice to him, once shortly after the arrival of the train at about midnight, and again at about 3 A. M. in the morning, showing clearly how urgent his need was.

It only remains therefore to consider how far his explanation of his conduct was or was not satisfactory.

His explanation was to the effect that the petitioner's mother's name had been entered in the list of passengers from an infected area, and that the woman was accordingly taken to the Detention Camp by the Plague Police on duty, that the procedure was for passengers from infected area arriving by the night train to be kept in the Detention Camp till next morning, when the Assistant Surgeon *usually* went and examined them; that such being the procedure, he could not interfere in the matter, and that he explained the situation to the petitioner and promised to have the woman examined early next morning, which he did. Now, as Inspecting Officer, the question whether or not a person need be detained in camp rested solely with him. If it was in his power to have the woman released in the morning, he must have known it was equally in his power to have her released at any other time he chose to give the order. Again, he must have known that it was solely for his convenience, because he has his ordinary medical duties to perform by day and could not be expected to meet the midnight train each night, that the procedure of placing passengers from an infected area in the Detention Camp for the night so that they could be examined next morning, was adopted. And he must therefore have known that he could, if he chose, and on any night he chose, examine arrivals on the night of arrival instead of next morning. Again, on learning, as he must have learnt from the petitioner that the woman was from an uninfected area, Madras, it must have been plain to him, that either the Davangere Plague Police were making a mistake or the woman had been entered wrongly in the list, and it was his duty to have had the mistake immediately rectified.

1899-1900

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

GENERAL

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 15th July 1899

No. 888-90 Mis. 3-93

Directing that, for reasons stated, Mr. S. K. Hanumantha Rao, Assistant Surgeon at Davangere, be degraded, as a punishment, to the lowest class of Sub-Assistant Surgeons and placed at the bottom of that class.

SBP—17-7-99—300